



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,402	12/28/2000	Michael Wayne Nelson	CSCO-85861	9515
7590	11/26/2003		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			VU, KIEU D	
Third Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Two North Market Street			2173	
San Jose, CA 95113			DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	09/752,402	NELSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kieu D Vu	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ .

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ . 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schloss ("Schloss", USP 5878233) and Jancke et al ("Jancke", USP 5764913).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 12, 18, 23, 29, 34, and 40 Schloss teaches a method for validating content (abstract) comprising the steps of displaying said content and displaying an indication (col 8, line 1, lines 33-34) of a state of the validation of said content (blocks 1982' and 1984' in Fig. 4C). Schloss does not explicitly teach that said state of content corresponds to not reviewed, use with caution; or reviewed with a positive validation; or reviewed with a negative validation. However, the feature of indicating the operational state is known in the art of computer network as taught by Jancke. Specifically, Jancke teaches a computer network monitoring system which comprises the use of green, yellow, and red lights to indicate the operational state of the system (Fig. 4, col 3, lines 17-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Schloss and Jancke before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Schloss to include the light system taught by Jancke with the motivation being to enable the system to accurately reflect the status of the content.

Regarding claims 2, 4-5, 13, 15-16, 24, 26-27, 35, and 37-38, Schloss teaches the receiving user submitted comments, validation, or validation of comment to said content, said submissions affecting said indicated state of validation of said content (Fig. 4C).

Regarding claims 3, 6, 14, 17, 25, 28, 36 and 39, Schloss teaches the corrections to said content and said correction of content affecting said validation of said content (col 6, lines 34-41).

Regarding claims 8, 19, 30, 41, Schloss teaches fields for displaying categories and sub-topics related to said content (Fig. 4C).

Regarding claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32, and 42-43, Schloss teaches that the content is new content (col 6, lines 24-25) or an addition to previously submitted content (col 6, lines 34-36).

Regarding claims 11, 22, 33, and 44, Jancke teaches the content is pertaining to technical information (col 3, lines 17-36).

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that "Shloss focus on the creating and revising of stored advisories related to data content and not on the display of indications..." it is noted that Schloss teaches the displaying indications of a state of the validation of the content (col 8, line 1, lines 33-34).

In response to Applicant's argument that "Jancke et al. reference is concerned with the monitoring of computer networks whereas Applicants Claim 1 is drawn to a

system which characterizes content", it is noted that the displaying red, green, and yellow lights to indicate three states of a monitoring system shows that Jancke teaching is concerned with the characterizing content of operational state of the system.

Therefore, the combination of Schloss and Jancke teach the claimed invention as clearly presented above.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu whose telephone number is (703-605-1232). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703- 308-3116).

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-9306

and / or:

(703)-746-5639 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for  
"INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal  
paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or  
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-  
3900).

Kieu D. Vu

11/25/03



JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100